

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 24 2007

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are pending. Claim 1 has been revised editorially. Claims 4 and 7-32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 have been rejected as obvious over Reiter in view of Yum and Chen. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The method of claim 1 uses the Ru compound as the electron carrier and glucose dehydrogenase as the enzyme. This permits the accurate measurement of a small amount of glucose in a short period of time. The benefits of the present method are demonstrated in the experimental work reported at pages 21-32 of the specification, with reference to Figs. 6-10. Note in particular the discussion of the results beginning at page 29, and the indication on page 30 that the combination of PQQGDH with Ru compound provided markedly inferior results.

Reiter discloses that the use of pyrroloquinolinquinone-dependent glucose dehydrogenase (i.e. PQQGDH) labeled (or coordinated) with a Ru complex provides desirable electrochemical and biological properties. Reiter fails to suggest the use of a Ru electron carrier and the glucose dehydrogenase to which cytochrome C is attached that is separate from the Ru electron carrier as required by claim 1. More specifically, Reiter suggests neither the use of Ru compound as an independent electron carrier as required by claim 1 (Reiter uses a glucose dehydrogenase coordinated with a Ru complex as an enzyme), nor the use of glucose dehydrogenase to which cytochrome C is attached (Reiter uses PQQGDH). As noted above, the results reported in the present specification show a marked superiority for the glucose dehydrogenase to which cytochrome C is attached in comparison with PQQGDH.

The rejection refers to Yum as evidence that Reiter meets the requirement for glucose dehydrogenase in claim 1. However, Yum refers only to gluconate dehydrogenase (GADH), not glucose dehydrogenase. Therefore, Yum does not provide competent teachings relative to Reiter or the present invention and does not support the position taken in the rejection.

The rejection cites Chen as suggesting the use of certain Ru compounds. However, Chen, like Yum, fails to support the position for which it is cited in the rejection. Chen discloses a glucose oxidase combined or coordinated with a redox salt (such as $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$) can be formed into a composite film that works as an enzyme electrode. This teaching has no relevance to the method of claim 1, which uses glucose dehydrogenase (GDH) as a redox enzyme and a Ru


compound as an independent electron carrier. Moreover, neither Yum nor Chen provides any reasonable basis to expect the superiority that the present invention enjoys over the PQQGDH used by Reiter.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Hamre, Schumann,
Mueller & Larson, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-455-3800

Date: August 24, 2007

By 
Name: Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
Customer No. 52835